

Regulatory Flexibility Threshold Analysis: Special Regulations for Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park

The Regulatory Flexibility Act, as amended, requires agencies to analyze impacts of regulatory actions on small entities (businesses, nonprofit organizations, and governments), and to consider alternatives that minimize such impacts while achieving regulatory objectives. Agencies must first conduct a threshold analysis to determine whether regulatory actions are expected to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. If the threshold analysis indicates a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, an initial regulatory flexibility analysis must be produced and made available for public review and comment along with the proposed regulatory action. A final regulatory flexibility analysis that considers public comments must then be produced and be made publicly available with the final regulatory action. Agencies must publish a certification of no significant impact on a substantial number of small entities if the threshold analysis does not indicate such impacts.

This threshold analysis examines the impacts of the proposed special regulations for Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park, Alaska. This analysis relies on the February 2015, Preliminary Cost/Benefit Analysis of the proposed action. A qualitative threshold analysis is used to determine whether this proposed action would impose significant impacts on a substantial number of small entities.

Qualitative Analysis of Impacts

The February 2015, Preliminary Cost/Benefit Analysis of this proposed action provides a description of the anticipated costs and benefits. That analysis concludes that no significant costs are anticipated for the proposed action. Consequently, no adverse impacts are expected for any sector of the economy or unit of government, including small entities. Moreover, any impacts that might occur as a result of this proposed action would be mitigated by the following factor:

- * A primary effect of this proposed action is to codify in NPS regulations a requirement related to closing the Dyea Historical Townsite to horses that already exists in the park compendium. Absent this proposed regulation, NPS would continue to enforce these requirements. Therefore, this proposed action would eliminate the need for the public to consult separate authorities. This proposed action would also improve the public's ability to participate in the development of restrictions, authorizations, and other management requirements through the Federal rule-making process. These effects are anticipated to benefit small entities.

Conclusion

This threshold analysis is based on the findings of the February 2015, cost/benefit analysis that no adverse impacts are expected for any sector of the economy or unit of government, including small entities. Given those findings, a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities is not anticipated from this proposed action.